

1416 Hill Street  
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Dear Kirby —

If you can manage to get away  
to spend Oct 31 here we'd be  
delighted. If this isn't convenient  
almost any date is all right for us.  
I am studying this year so that I'm  
staying close to home and days are  
equally busy at the farm I guess.  
It will be good to see you!

Affectionately

Laura.

Kirby Page, Editor  
"The World Tomorrow"

Author of: "The Monroe Doctrine and World Peace"

32 Crafton Avenue  
Pitman, New Jersey  
August , 1933

Dear Mr. Page: —

May I have permission to quote from your ~~book~~ <sup>pamphlet</sup> in a series of lesson helps which is being planned to inculcate more tolerant racial attitudes in high school students? It is planned to print or mimeograph ten of these pamphlets, each of which will deal with a different group.

I am attaching a copy of the material which I should like to use from your book. Guided by Teachers College, Columbia, I have been working along these lines for several years in schools in Washington, D. C. and Philadelphia and Boston. The plan that I have tried has been so useful to teachers that I am now preparing them for wider distribution.

If you are willing, may we have your permission as soon as it is convenient, as I am hoping to get some of the material to the printer at an early date. (I am, of course, also writing to the publisher.)<sup>#</sup> I can assure you I shall heartily appreciate your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours

Rachel Davis-DuBois  
(Mrs.) Rachel Davis-DuBois

<sup>#</sup> I think this will not be necessary.

## THE MONROE DOCTRINE

You know what the Monroe Doctrine is because you have studied it in your history classes; but did you know that there has been always much confusion among students and politicians as to the meaning and the proper interpretation of it, and even, among the people, much ignorance concerning it? Kirby Page, in "The World To-morrow" for October, 1928, reminds us that Mr. Tilden once observed that he thought "The Monroe Doctrine might be a good thing if one could only find out just what it was." He also tells us of a hope ardently expressed by an orator at a banquet: "May the Monroe Doctrine be as liberally interpreted to-day as it was in the time of Washington." We quote from Mr. Page:

"What did President Monroe intend to say in his Message to Congress in 1823? What was the situation to which he addressed himself? What was his primary purpose? It seems unnecessary that the answers to these questions should be clouded and obscure. There were five significant aspects to Mr. Monroe's famous pronouncement:

"1. The American continents "are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power."

"2. Any effort to extend the European monarchical system 'to any portion of this hemisphere' would be considered 'as dangerous to our peace and safety.'

"3. 'With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere.'

"4. The determination of the United States not to become involved in European controversies was again proclaimed. 'In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. ....Our policy in regard to Europe...is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers.'

" 3. The policy of non-intervention by the United States in the affairs of other American countries was announced. 'It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course.'

" The primary purpose of President Monroe was to safe-guard the United States from the machinations of the Holy Alliance and from the encroachment of European powers, especially Russia and Spain, on our territory. The pronouncement was solely a measure of self-defense. Professor W. R. Shepherd has pointed out that throughout Monroe's message there 'runs like a red thread one connecting idea and purpose: the defense of the United States against aggression from overseas. No strain of altruism is there; no trace of a desire to do more than defend what was justly ours; no thought of doing anything other than protect the national interests of the United States and them alone.' It did not place upon us any obligation whatever to go to the assistance of any other American country unless we wished to do so as a defense measure. It did not establish protectorates over other countries on this hemisphere.

" The Monroe Doctrine is now widely interpreted as prohibiting even the temporary armed intervention of European powers in Latin America in order to protect the lives and property of their citizens.....

" ....The original pronouncement of Monroe has been extended at various times, especially by President Polk in the Yucatan case of 1845, by Secretary Olney in the Venezuelan crisis of 1895, and by the Senate in the Magdalena Bay case of 1912. President Polk interpreted the doctrine as prohibiting the acquisition of further American Territory by the European powers, even with the consent of the Latin American country involved. Secretary Olney maintained that the geographical situation made it 'unnatural and inexpedient' for European countries

to maintain control over any American territories and astonished the world, including his own countrymen, by the oft-repeated declaration; 'To-day the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subject to which it confined its interposition.' The purpose of the Senate resolution in 1912 was to exclude Japan from control over American territory.

## THE ROOSEVELDT DOCTRINE

It remained for President Roosevelt, however, to make the most significant extension of the Monroe Doctrine. In 1901 he had declared: 'We do not guarantee any state against punishment if it misconducts itself, provided that punishment does not take the form of acquisition of territory by any non-American power.' That is to say, coercive measures of a temporary character were not denied to European powers, nor did the United States assume responsibility for protecting European interests on these continents. But in 1904, President Roosevelt made a drastic change in policy. In his annual message of that year he said:

"Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power.

"Here we have quite a different doctrine from the one pronounced by Monroe. The idea of a protectorate is definitely accepted and responsibility is assumed for maintaining law and order by the exercise

of 'international police power.' Succeeding presidents and secretaries of state have acted on this theory and it seems now to be firmly established as a national policy. European and Asiatic powers must not intervene, even temporarily, in Central and South America. If foreign lives and property are endangered in any of these countries, the United States feels obliged to intervene. This is the defense frequently given for our thirty armed interventions in Latin American countries since the Spanish American War. This may be or it may not be a sound policy. But it is not the Monroe Doctrine. It is the Roosevelt-Taft-Wilson-Harding-Coolidge Doctrine. 'If Monroe were alive today,' says Professor J. W. Garner, 'he would be quite unable to recognize the policy which still bears his honored name, but which is not in fact his offspring.'

"Even if it be admitted that the Monroe Doctrine neither authorizes nor obligates the United States to intervene in other American countries, the problem of protecting the lives and property of our citizens and of European nationals in Central and South America still remains. By what means shall we seek safety and justice for aliens in the Caribbean Region?

Through answers to a questionnaire concerning the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. Page gives, as answers to the questions suggested above, the often conflicting opinions of citizens representing different professions. As to the administration of the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. Page has this to say:

"Should the Monroe Doctrine be administered solely by the United States or jointly with the Latin American countries or abandoned entirely? Only thirty persons voted for its abandonment and only fifty-seven

for its exclusive administration by the United States. The great majority--192 persons--favored collective responsibility for its maintenance.

"The reasons for taking the latter position seem to be as follows; First, many Latin Americans keenly resent our self-appointed guardianship. At least four out of five of these countries have reached a high degree of stability and civilization and have no need whatever for our supervision. 'From the Latin-American point of view,' says Hiram Bingham, 'the continuance of the Monroe Doctrine is insulting.' Second, the situation has changed drastically since the original pronouncement was made and there is little likelihood of European aggression on this hemisphere. Third, the fact that most of these countries are members of the League of Nations and of the permanent Court of International Justice seems to them to reduce the need for our protecting arm.

"Fourth, the idea is widely prevalent among our southern neighbors that the Monroe Doctrine, as it is now being interpreted, is a smoke screen behind which the United States seeks to hide its aggressive economic designs on other American countries. 'The doctrine of Monroe,' says a Latin American editor, 'is the shield and buckler of the United States aggression; it is a sword suspended by a hair over the Latin continent.' Senator Brandeis has pointed out that if the doctrine is loosely interpreted 'it becomes a dagger and not a shield' to Latin Americans. Professor C. H. Haring has recently called attention to the fact that 'against the United States itself the Doctrine affords no protection, but may even serve as a camouflage of American encroachments upon their independence.' An anonymous writer in 'Foreign Affairs' says that 'an overlordship on the part of their great northern sister is today infi-

nitely more feared by the Latin republics than is any danger from European imperialism.' Professor A. L. P. Dennis says: 'Indeed, the many sins which have been laid at the door of the Monroe Doctrine are such as to fill a student of history with regret.'

"Fifth, there seems to be some evidence that certain Latin American governments are made more reckless in their financial dealings with European investors by the assumption that the United States will protect them from European reprisals. The following words were written fifteen years ago, but they are ~~xx~~ even more significant today: 'The maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine (in its current interpretation) is going to cost the United States an immense amount of trouble, money, and men.' Sixth, arbitrary armed intervention on our part sets a bad example for other powers and inhibits us from an effective protest against the imperialistic excesses of other nations. Seventh, collective responsibility by Pan-American prestige and serve as a check to the arbitrary extension of the political and economic power of the United States. Therefore, it seems probable that collective responsibility for preserving the freedom and integrity of American countries would increase international understanding and friendship. "

Mr. P. ends his article with the question --- "What can we do?" He answers the question thus: " First there should be a nationwide educational campaign concerning the Monroe Doctrine. Its original intent should be clearly differentiated from many current interpretations. By this means it is possible greatly to reduce its emotional explosiveness. 'While retaining the Doctrine,' said Secretary Hughes, 'we should make every effort to avoid its being misunderstood. If its import has been obscure, it is largely because it has often been treated as though it were our sole policy in this hemisphere....

Attempts to stretch the Doctrine have made it in some quarters a mystery and in others a cause of offense.'

"Second, an effort should be made to induce governmental officials and other leaders of public opinion to use the words 'Monroe Doctrine' in an accurate sense--that is, when reference is made to excluding European nations from further colonization or the extension of the monarchical system on this hemisphere--and to use other expressions, say the Roosevelt Doctrine or the Coolidge Doctrine, to connote new policies, as, for example, the exercise of a so-called 'police power' in the Caribbean, which were not contemplated by President Monroe.

"Third, the United States should share responsibility for safeguarding, by peaceable means, the territorial and political integrity of the nations on this hemisphere with Canada and the Latin American countries.

"Fourth, the doctrine of arbitrary armed intervention by the United States in the Caribbean should be abandoned and in its place should be substituted the Pan-American Doctrine, under which our government would cooperate with other Pan-American countries in strengthening pacific means of maintaining security, perhaps by the gradual transformation of the Pan-American Union, or, if this seems unwise, by creating new Pan-American agencies of justice.

The Monroe Doctrine has in the past undoubtedly helped to maintain peace in this hemisphere. The prevailing tendency to use the phrase as a justification for every new procedure we see fit to adopt in the Caribbean, however, is fraught with great peril

to international peace and friendship. The Monroe Doctrine should be retained in its original form and supplemented by a new Pan-American Doctrine." The Monroe Doctrine and World Peace--Kirby Page, The World To-morrow, October, 1928.

As you see, there are a number of questions for reflection and debate in the above. If you are interested in further research into the article, you can get it in pamphlet form for ten cents each, seventy-five cents per dozen, from Kirby Page at 347 Madison Avenue, New York City.

J. J. Handsaker, Associate Secretary of the National Council for Prevention of War, offered to the students of the Eugene Bible College, (Disciples) Eugene, Oregon five hundred copies of Kirby Page's "National Defense" (abridged) and twenty copies "Law or War" by Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead on condition that they would sell the books and invest the proceeds in a library on war and peace. The books reached the school late Saturday night, January 14, and on January 17 the following letter was received:

"Received the books you so generously offered us. Have divided the town into four parts and canvassers have started to work. We are making a house to house canvass. Had a meeting with Miss Capps and received assurance of the cooperation of the P. T. A. of the city. I am to meet Mrs. Good who is President of the County P. T. A. groups, and make arrangements for appointments in the outlying districts. Have arranged for an engagement for you at Cloverdale Community Club at your convenience. Will have all the churches in the city lined up by the end of the week. We surely appreciate your most generous offer and are starting to work with a will.

"Wishing you success and the blessing of God, I am"

(SIGNED) Your brother,

Wm. Cone

---

Mr. Cone is a ministerial student who enlisted in the Canadian Army at the age of fifteen and at the age of sixteen was sent to the front where he saw more than three years of active service.

Dear Kirby:

I'm sending this along because I  
want you to realize what a disappoint-  
one day loss of your time in the region  
can be to a college. We had thought  
the college itself could have its conference  
with you on "Living creatively" with  
people paying & signed up to attend  
all the sessions. Of course, it would  
work you mighty hard. Stella!

From Sociology Syllabus  
315 by Edwin Leavitt  
Clark

The Sociology of International  
Conflict

1933

Rollins College Winter Park  
Fla

Syllabus for course